arXiv:1702.01876v4 [math.RT] 10 Apr 2017

UNITARY REPRESENTATIONS WITH DIRAC COHOMOLOGY: A FINITENESS RESULT

JIAN DING AND CHAO-PING DONG

Abstract. Let G be a connected complex simple Lie group, and let $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$ be the set of all irreducible unitary representations with non-vanishing Dirac cohomology. We show that $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$ consists of two parts: finitely many scattered representations, and finitely many strings of representations. Moreover, the strings of $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$ come from $\widehat{L}^{\mathrm{d}}$ via cohomological induction and they are all in the good range. Here L runs over the θ-stable proper Levi subgroups of G. It follows that figuring out $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$ requires a finite calculation in total. As an application, we report a complete description of $\widehat{F}_4^{\mathrm{d}}$.

1. Introduction

In representation theory of Lie groups, Parthasarathy firstly introduced the Dirac operator to give a geometric construction for most of the discrete series [25], whose algebraic classification was achieved by Harish-Chandra in a series of papers. This project was finished by Atiyah and Schmid [3]. A byproduct is Parthasarathy's Dirac inequality [26], which effectively detects non-unitarity and has played vital roles in the classification of several families of irreducible unitary modules, say that of unitary highest weight modules, see Enright, Howe, Wallach [13] and Jakobsen [20].

The algebraic version of Dirac operator was introduced by Vogan [32] in 1997. After the verification of Vogan conjecture by Huang and Pandžić [17], Dirac cohomology became a new invariant for unitary representations of semisimple Lie groups. Since then, classifying all the irreducible unitary representations with non-vanishing Dirac cohomology became an interesting problem which remained open. Among the entire unitary dual, as we shall see from (2), these representations are exactly the ones where Dirac inequality becomes equality. Thus understanding them thoroughly should also be important. We refer the reader to Huang [16] for a summary of the developments of Dirac cohomology before or around 2015. In particular, that paper suggests certain connection of Dirac cohomology with endoscopy.

An important way to construct unitary representations is using cohomological induction. For instance, Salamanca-Riba [27] proved that any irreducible unitary representation with strongly regular infinitesimal character is an $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$-module. Namely, it is cohomologically induced from a one-dimensional representation. Inspired by the work of Huang, Kang and Pandžić [18], formulas for Dirac cohomology of cohomologically induced modules are obtained whenever they are in the good range, see [7] for complex Lie groups and [11] for real reductive Lie groups in the Harish-Chandra class. However, beyond the good range, we

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 22E46.

Key words and phrases. Dirac cohomology, good range, spin norm, unitary representation.

Dong is supported by NSFC grant 11571097 and the China Scholarship Council.

almost know nothing unifying about Dirac cohomology of these modules. This point has perplexed us for about six years. Surprisingly, Theorem A below says that for complex Lie groups there are at most finitely many such modules.

Now let us be more precise. Let G be a connected complex simple Lie group with Cartan involution θ. Let $K := G^\theta$ be a maximal compact subgroup of G, and let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$ be the corresponding Cartan decomposition on the complexified Lie algebra level. Then the Dirac cohomology of a Harish-Chandra module π is defined as the $\widetilde{K}$-module

$$H_D(\pi) = \mathrm{Ker}\, D/(\mathrm{Im}\, D \cap \mathrm{Ker} D), \tag{1}$$

where $\widetilde{K}$ is the spin double covering group of K. Here the Dirac operator D acts on $\pi \otimes S_G$, where S_G is a spin module of the Clifford algebra $C(\mathfrak{p})$. We care the most about the case that π is unitary. Then

$$H_D(\pi) = \mathrm{Ker}\, D = \mathrm{Ker}\, D^2. \tag{2}$$

Parthasarathy's Dirac inequality now reads as $D^2 \geq 0$, and it becomes equality on π if and only if $H_D(\pi)$ is non-vanishing.

Let $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$ be the set of all irreducible unitary representations of G with non-zero Dirac cohomology. The first result of the current paper is the following description of $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$.

Theorem A. *The set $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$ for a connected complex simple Lie group consists of two parts:*

a) *finitely many scattered modules (the scattered part); and*
b) *finitely many strings of modules (the string part).*

Moreover, modules in the string part of G are all cohomologically induced from the scattered part of $\widehat{L}^{\mathrm{d}}_{\mathrm{ss}}$ tensored with unitary characters of $Z(L)$, and they are all in the good range. Here L runs over the proper θ-stable Levi subgroups of G, $Z(L)$ is the center of L, and L_{ss} denotes the semisimple factor of L. In particular, there are at most finitely many modules of $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$ beyond the good range.

The proof involves the following ingredients: an analysis of Dirac inequality, results from Vogan [30], and Theorem 6.1 of [7]. The key idea is arranging the candidate representations into s-families, see Section 3.1. In view of Theorem A, to figure out $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$, it suffices to understand the scattered parts of $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$ and $\widehat{L}^{\mathrm{d}}_{\mathrm{ss}}$ for the finitely many Levis. Furthermore, Proposition 3.4 says that it boils down to consider finitely many candidate representations to sieve out the scattered part of $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$. Therefore, pining down $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$ requires a finite calculation in total. From this aspect, we interpret Theorem A as a *finiteness* result.

We introduce a computing method that allows us to sieve out the finite many candidate representations more efficiently. The basic idea is to study the distribution of the spin norm along the Vogan pencil [29] starting from the lowest K-type, see Section 6 for more. Thanks to the breakthrough in achieving an algorithm for computing unitarity by Adams, van Leeuwen, Trapa and Vogan [1], and thanks to the recent development of the software Atlas [2], one can eventually handle these finite candidates completely.

As an application, let us report the following complete description of $\widehat{F}^{\mathrm{d}}_4$.

Theorem B. *The set $\widehat{F}^{\mathrm{d}}_4$ consists of ten scattered representations (see Table 3) whose spin-lowest K-types are all unitarily small, and thirty strings of representations (see Table 2).*

Moreover, each representation $\pi \in \widehat{F_4}^{\mathrm{d}}$ has a unique spin-lowest K-type which occurs with multiplicity one.

In Theorem B, the notion unitarily small (*u-small* for short) K-type was raised by Salamanca-Riba and Vogan [28] in their unified conjecture on the shape of $\widehat{G}$, the unitary dual of G. This notion also plays a role in our computing method in Section 6. We remark that Huang [15] kindly told the second named author that he announced the following conjecture at a conference: for any irreducible unitary representation π with non-zero Dirac cohomology, any K-type contributing to $H_D(\pi)$ has multiplicity one. This conjecture motivates the last statement of Theorem B.

Finally, we make the following.

Conjecture C. *Let G be a connected complex simple Lie group. Any π in the scattered part of $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$ has a unique spin-lowest K-type which must be u-small.*

If Conjecture C holds, then by Theorem A, we could conclude that any $\pi \in \widehat{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$ has a unique spin-lowest K-type. This phenomenon does not hold for real Lie groups, see Barbasch and Pandžić [6].

The paper is organized as follows. We set up the notation and collect necessary preliminaries in Section 2. Theorem A is proved in Section 3. Then we study the Dirac cohomology of tempered representations, minimal representations and model representations in Section 4. Dirac cohomology of the spherical unitary dual is investigated in Section 5. Then we introduce a computing method and illustrate it carefully for the G_2 case in Section 6. Sections 7 and 8 are devoted to determining the string part and the scattered part of $\widehat{F_4}^{\mathrm{d}}$, respectively. Finally, Section 9 is an appendix indexing the 140 involutions of F_4.

Acknowledgements. This paper is a continuation of the second named author's 2011 PhD thesis. It is a constant pleasure to thank his advisor Prof. Huang. He thanks Prof. Adams and Prof. Paul sincerely for teaching him Atlas with great patience. He also thanks the math department of MIT for offering excellent working conditions. Finally, he is deeply grateful to Prof. Vogan for many many things.

2. Preliminaries

This section aims to collect some preliminaries. Firstly, let us set up the basic notation. Throughout this paper $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$, $\mathbb{P} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ and $\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}$ denotes the set of all positive integers and half-integers.

Let G be a connected complex simple Lie group viewed as a real Lie group. Let θ be the Cartan involution of G, and assume that $K := G^\theta$ is a maximal compact group of G. Denote by $\mathfrak{g}_0$ and $\mathfrak{k}_0$ the Lie algebras of G and K, respectively. We denote by $\langle\, , \rangle$ the Killing form form on $\mathfrak{g}$, which is negative definite on $\mathfrak{k}_0$ and positive definite on $\mathfrak{p}_0$. Moreover, $\mathfrak{k}$ and $\mathfrak{p}$ are orthogonal to each other under $\langle\, , \rangle$.

Let T be a maximal torus of K. Let $\mathfrak{a}_0 = \sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t}_0$ and $A = \exp(\mathfrak{a}_0)$. Then up to conjugation, $H = TA$ is the unique θ-stable Cartan subgroup of G. As usual, we drop the subscripts to denote the complexifications. We identify

$$\mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{g}_0 \times \mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{h} \cong \mathfrak{h}_0 \times \mathfrak{h}_0, \mathfrak{t} \cong \{(x, -x) : x \in \mathfrak{h}_0\}, \mathfrak{a} \cong \{(x, x) : x \in \mathfrak{h}_0\}. \tag{3}$$

Fix a Borel subgroup B of G containing H. Put $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{h}_0) = \Delta(\mathfrak{b}_0, \mathfrak{h}_0)$. Then we have the corresponding simple roots $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_l$ and fundamental weights $\varpi_1, \cdots, \varpi_l$. Note that

$$\langle \varpi_i, \check{\alpha_j} \rangle = \delta_{ij},$$

where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker notation. Set $[l] := \{1, 2, \ldots, l\}$. Denote by s_i the simple reflection s_{α_i}. Let ρ be the half sum of positive roots in $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{h}_0)$. In this paper, we always use the fundamental weights as a basis to express a weight. That is, $[n_1, \cdots, n_l]$ stands for the weight $\sum_{i=1}^{l} n_i \varpi_i$. For instance, $\rho = [1, 1, 1, 1]$ for complex F_4. We denote by W the Weyl group $W(\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{h}_0)$, which has identity element e and longest element w_0. Then $W(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) \simeq W \times W$.

2.1. **Zhelobenko classification.** The classification of irreducible admissible modules for complex Lie groups was obtained by Zhelobenko. Let $(\lambda_L, \lambda_R) \in \mathfrak{h}_0^* \times \mathfrak{h}_0^*$ be such that $\lambda_L - \lambda_R$ is a weight of a finite dimensional holomorphic representation of G. We can view $\lambda_L - \lambda_R$ as a weight of T and $\lambda_L + \lambda_R$ as a character of A. Let

$$X(\lambda_L, \lambda_R) := \mathrm{Ind}_B^G[\mathbb{C}_{\lambda_L - \lambda_R} \otimes \mathbb{C}_{\lambda_L + \lambda_R} \otimes 1]_{K-finite}.$$

Theorem 2.1. (Zhelobenko [33]) *The K-type with extremal weight $\lambda_L - \lambda_R$ occurs with multiplicity one in $X(\lambda_L, \lambda_R)$. Let $J(\lambda_L, \lambda_R)$ be the unique subquotient of $X(\lambda_L, \lambda_R)$ containing this K-type.*

a) *Every irreducible admissible $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$-module is of the form $J(\lambda_L, \lambda_R)$.*
b) *Two such modules $J(\lambda_L, \lambda_R)$ and $J(\lambda'_L, \lambda'_R)$ are equivalent if and only if there exists $w \in W$ such that $w\lambda_L = \lambda'_L$ and $w\lambda_R = \lambda'_R$.*
c) *The representation $X(\lambda_L, \lambda_R)$ is tempered if and only if $\lambda_L + \lambda_R \in i\mathfrak{h}_0^*$. In this case, $X(\lambda_L, \lambda_R) = J(\lambda_L, \lambda_R)$.*

We will refer to the ordered pair (λ_L, λ_R) as the *Zhelobenko parameters* of $J(\lambda_L, \lambda_R)$. For instance, the trivial representation has Zhelobenko parameters (ρ, ρ). We will also refer to $\lambda_L - \lambda_R$ (resp. $\lambda_L + \lambda_R$) as the T-parameter (resp. A-parameter) of $J(\lambda_L, \lambda_R)$.

2.2. **Dirac cohomology.** Fix an orthonormal basis $Z_1, \cdots, Z_n$ of $\mathfrak{p}_0$ with respect to the inner product induced by $\langle , \rangle$. Let $U(\mathfrak{g})$ be the universal enveloping algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ and let $C(\mathfrak{p})$ be the Clifford algebra of $\mathfrak{p}$ with respect to $\langle , \rangle$. The Dirac operator $D \in U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes C(\mathfrak{p})$ is defined as

$$D = \sum_{i=1}^{n} Z_i \otimes Z_i.$$

It is easy to check that D does not depend on the choice of the orthonormal basis Z_i and it is K-invariant for the diagonal action of K given by adjoint actions on both factors. This purely algebraic version was introduced by Vogan [32].

Let $\widetilde{K}$ be the subgroup of $K \times \mathrm{Spin}\,\mathfrak{p}_0$ consisting of all pairs (k, s) such that $\mathrm{Ad}(k) = p(s)$, where $\mathrm{Ad} : K \to \mathrm{SO}(\mathfrak{p}_0)$ is the adjoint action, and $p : \mathrm{Spin}\,\mathfrak{p}_0 \to \mathrm{SO}(\mathfrak{p}_0)$ is the spin double covering map. If π is a $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ module, and if S_G denotes a spin module for $C(\mathfrak{p})$, then $\pi \otimes S_G$ is a $(U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes C(\mathfrak{p}), \widetilde{K})$ module. The action of $U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes C(\mathfrak{p})$ is the obvious one, and $\widetilde{K}$ acts on both factors, on π through K and on S_G through the spin group $\mathrm{Spin}\,\mathfrak{p}_0$. Now the Dirac operator acts on $\pi \otimes S_G$, and the Dirac cohomology of π is the $\widetilde{K}$-module defined in (1). By setting the linear functionals on $\mathfrak{t}$ to be zero on $\mathfrak{a}$, we embed $\mathfrak{t}^*$ as a subspace of

$\mathfrak{h}^*$. Let ρ_c be the half-sum of positive roots in $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{k},\mathfrak{t})$. The following foundational result, conjectured by Vogan, was proved by Huang and Pandžić in Theorem 2.3 of [17].

Theorem 2.2. (Huang and Pandžić) *Let π be an irreducible $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ module. Assume that the Dirac cohomology of π is nonzero, and that it contains the $\widetilde{K}$-type E_γ with highest weight $\gamma \in \mathfrak{t}^* \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$. Then the infinitesimal character of π is conjugate to $\gamma + \rho_c$ under $W(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{h})$.*

2.3. **Cohomological induction.** For complex Lie groups, cohomological induction is essentially equivalent to the ordinary parabolic induction. However, adopting the former setting will give us convenience in utilizing existing results on cohomological induction. Let us give a brief review. Fix a non-zero element $H \in i\mathfrak{t}_0$, then a θ-stable parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{l}\oplus\mathfrak{u}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ can be defined as the sum of nonnegative eigenspaces of $\mathrm{ad}(H)$. Here the Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{l}$ of $\mathfrak{q}$ is the zero eigenspace of $\mathrm{ad}(H)$, while the nilradical $\mathfrak{u}$ of $\mathfrak{q}$ is the sum of positive eigenspaces of $\mathrm{ad}(H)$. Then it follows from $\theta(H) = H$ that $\mathfrak{l}$, $\mathfrak{u}$ and $\mathfrak{q}$ are all θ-stable. Let $L = N_G(\mathfrak{q})$, which is connected and has $K_L := L \cap K$ as a maximal compact subgroup.

Set

$$\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{h}) = \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}_0,\mathfrak{h}_0) \times \{0\} \cup \{0\} \times (-\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}_0,\mathfrak{h}_0)),$$

which is θ-stable. Let us arrange the positive root systems in a compatible way, that is, $\Delta(\mathfrak{u}) \subseteq \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{h})$ and set $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{h}) = \Delta(\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{h}) \cap \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{h})$. Let ρ^L denote the half sum of roots in $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{h})$. We denote by $\rho(\mathfrak{u})$ the half sum of roots in $\Delta(\mathfrak{u},\mathfrak{h})$. Then

$$\rho = \rho^L + \rho(\mathfrak{u}).$$

Let Z be an $(\mathfrak{l}, K_L)$ module. Cohomological induction functors attach to Z certain $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$-modules $\mathcal{L}_j(Z)$ and $\mathcal{R}^j(Z)$, where j is a nonnegative integer. For a definition, see Chapter 2 of [23]. Suppose that λ is the infinitesimal character of Z. We say Z or λ is *in good range* if

$$\mathrm{Re}\langle \lambda + \rho(\mathfrak{u}),\, \alpha\rangle > 0, \quad \forall \alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{u},\mathfrak{h}). \tag{4}$$

The following theorem, mainly due to Vogan, contains fundamental results on cohomological parabolic induction.

Theorem 2.3. (Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 of [30], or Theorems 0.50 and 0.51 of [23]) *Suppose the admissible $(\mathfrak{l}, L\cap K)$-module Z is in the good range. Then we have*

a) $\mathcal{L}_j(Z) = \mathcal{R}^j(Z) = 0$ *for* $j \neq S$, *where* $S := \dim(\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{k})$.
b) $\mathcal{L}_S(Z) \cong \mathcal{R}^S(Z)$ *as $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$-modules. They are both non-zero.*
c) $\mathcal{L}_S(Z)$ *is irreducible if and only if Z is irreducible.*
d) $\mathcal{L}_S(Z)$ *is unitary if and only if Z is unitary.*

The following result was obtained in the second named author's thesis, see also Theorem 6.1 of [7].

Theorem 2.4. *Let G be a connected complex simple Lie group. Let Z be an irreducible unitary $(\mathfrak{l}, K_L)$ module with infinitesimal character $\lambda \in i\mathfrak{t}_0^*$ which is dominant for $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{l}\cap\mathfrak{k},\mathfrak{t})$. Assume that*

$$\lambda + \rho(\mathfrak{u}) \text{ is dominant integral regular for } \Delta^+(\mathfrak{k},\mathfrak{t}). \tag{5}$$

Then $H_D(\mathcal{L}_S(Z))$ is non-zero if and only if $H_D(Z)$ is non-zero.

We remark that for complex Lie groups, the requirement (5) implies the good range condition (4).

2.4. **Spin norm and spin lowest K-type.** The notions spin norm and spin-lowest K-type were raised in the second named author's thesis for real reductive Lie group. They are motivated for the classification of irreducible unitary representations with non-zero Dirac cohomology. Let us recall them for complex Lie groups. We identify a K-type δ with its highest weight. Then

$$\|\delta\|_{\text{spin}} = \|\{\delta - \rho\} + \rho\| \tag{6}$$

is the *spin norm* of the K-type δ. Here $\{\delta - \rho\}$ is the unique dominant weight to which $\mu - \rho$ is conjugated under the action of W. It is obvious that

$$\|\delta\|_{\text{spin}} \geq \|\delta\| \tag{7}$$

and equality holds if and only if δ is regular. Now for any irreducible admissible $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$-module π, we define

$$\|\pi\|_{\text{spin}} = \min \|\delta\|_{\text{spin}}, \tag{8}$$

where δ runs over all the K-types occurring in π. We call δ a *spin lowest K-type* of π if it occurs in π and $\|\delta\|_{\text{spin}} = \|\pi\|_{\text{spin}}$.

The following reslut is a combination of the ideas and results of Parthasarathy [25, 26], Vogan [32], Huang and Pandžić [17].

Proposition 2.5. *For any irreducible unitary $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$-module π with infinitesimal character Λ, let δ be any K-type occurring in π. Then*

a) $\|\pi\|_{\text{spin}} \geq \|\Lambda\|$, *and the equality holds if and only if $H_D(\pi)$ is non-zero.*
b) $\|\delta\|_{\text{spin}} \geq \|\Lambda\|$, *and the equality holds if and only if δ contributes to $H_D(\pi)$.*
c) *If $H_D(\pi) \neq 0$, it is exactly the spin lowest K-types of π that contribute to $H_D(\pi)$.*

Therefore, conceptually, spin norm and spin lowest K-type give the right framework for the classification of $\widehat{G}^{\text{d}}$.

2.5. **Vogan pencil.** Let β be the highest root. The following result is a special case of Lemma 3.4 and Corollary 3.5 of [29]. It coarsely describes the K-types pattern for an infinite dimensional irreducible $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$-module π.

Proposition 2.6. (Vogan) *Let G be a connected complex simple Lie group. Then for any infinite dimensional irreducible $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$-module π, there is a unique set*

$$\{\mu_{\mathfrak{i}} \,|\, \mathfrak{i} \in I\} \subseteq i\mathfrak{t}_0^*$$

of dominant integral weights such that all the K-types of π are precisely

$$\{\mu_{\mathfrak{i}} + n\beta \,|\, \mathfrak{i} \in I, n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

We call a set of K-types

$$P(\delta) := \{\delta + n\beta \,|\, n \in \mathbb{N}\} \tag{9}$$

a *Vogan pencil*. For instance, $P(0)$ denotes the pencil starting from the trivial K-type. We also set

$$P_\delta := \min\{\|\delta + n\beta\|_{\text{spin}} \,|\, n \in \mathbb{N}\}. \tag{10}$$

Calculating P_δ will be vital for us in later sections. By Theorem 1.1 of [9], we have

$$P_\delta = \begin{cases} \min\{\|\delta + n\beta\|_{\text{spin}} \mid \delta + n\beta \text{ is u-small}\} & \text{if } \delta \text{ is u-small;} \\ \|\delta\|_{\text{spin}} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

3. Proof of Theorem A

This section aims to prove Theorem A.

3.1. **s-families.** As deduced by Barbasch and Pandžić [5] from Theorem 2.2, to find all the irreducible unitary representations with non-zero Dirac cohomology, it suffices to consider the following candidates

$$J(\lambda, -s\lambda), \tag{12}$$

where $s \in W$ is an involution, and 2λ is dominant integral and regular.

There are two ways of indexing the representations in (12). On one hand, we can fix λ, and let s varies. For instance, Barbasch and Pandžić fixed $\lambda = \rho/2$ and studied the representations $J(\rho/2, -s\rho/2)$ carefully in Section 3 of [5]. These representations deserve particular attention since they have the smallest possible infinitesimal character.

On the other hand, one can fix s and let λ varies. Thinking in this way leads us to denote

$$\Lambda(s) := \{\lambda = [\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_l] \mid 2\lambda_i \in \mathbb{P} \text{ and } \lambda + s\lambda \text{ is integral}\}. \tag{13}$$

We call $\Lambda(s)$ and the corresponding representations $J(\lambda, -s\lambda)$ an *s-family*. Note that an s-family has infinitely many members. For instance, the e-family consists of tempered representations, and they will be handled in Section 4; while on the other extreme, spherical representations live in the w_0-family, and they will be considered in Section 5.

3.2. **Involutions and strings.** Fix an involution s. Put

$$I(s) := \{i \in [l] \mid s(\varpi_i) = \varpi_i\}. \tag{14}$$

It turns out that this set will play an important role in subsequent discussions. Thus let us give an equivalent description for it. In particular, it says that the involution s actually lives in the subgroup $\langle s_j \mid j \in [l] \setminus I(s)\rangle$ of W.

Lemma 3.1. *Let s be an element of the Weyl group W. Then the following are equivalent.*

a) $s(\varpi_i) = \varpi_i$;
b) *the simple reflection s_i does not occur in one reduced expression of s;*
c) *the simple reflection s_i does not occur in any reduced expression of s.*

Proof. The only non-trivial step is to show that (a) implies (c). Let $s = s_{\gamma_1} s_{\gamma_2} \cdots s_{\gamma_n}$ be any reduced decomposition of s into simple root reflections, and suppose that j is the smallest index such that $\gamma_j = \alpha_i$. Then, by Lemma 5.5 of [10],

$$\varpi_i - s(\varpi_i) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \langle \varpi_i, \check{\gamma_k} \rangle \, s_{\gamma_1} s_{\gamma_2} \cdots s_{\gamma_{k-1}}(\gamma_k),$$

where $s_{\gamma_1} s_{\gamma_2} \cdots s_{\gamma_{k-1}}(\gamma_k)$ is a positive root for each k. In particular, when $k = j$, the term on the RHS is non-zero. Thus $s(\varpi_i) \neq \varpi_i$, contradiction. □

Let I be a *non-empty* subset of $[l]$. Recall the s-family $\Lambda(s)$ from (13). We call

$$\{\lambda \in \Lambda(s) \mid \lambda_i \text{ varies for } i \in I \text{ and } \lambda_j \text{ is fixed for } j \in [l] \setminus I\} \tag{15}$$

and the corresponding representations $J(\lambda, -s\lambda)$ an (s, I)-*string*. When s is known from the context, we may call it an I-string or just a string. Since the non-emptyness of I is built into the definition, an (s, I)-string also contains infinitely many members.

3.3. **An analysis of Parthasatharathy's Dirac inequality.** Fix an involution s, and let $\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{l} \lambda_i \varpi_i \in \Lambda(s)$. Put $\mu = \{\lambda + s\lambda\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_1(\lambda) :&= \|2\lambda\|^2 - \|\mu\|^2_{\text{spin}} \\
&= \|\lambda - s\lambda\|^2 + \|\lambda + s\lambda\|^2 - \|\mu\|^2_{\text{spin}} \\
&= \|\lambda - s\lambda\|^2 + \|\mu\|^2 - \|\mu\|^2_{\text{spin}} \\
&= \|\lambda - s\lambda\|^2 + \|\mu - \rho + \rho\|^2 - \|\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho\|^2 \\
&= \|\lambda - s\lambda\|^2 - 2\langle\{\mu - \rho\} - (\mu - \rho), \rho\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, to understand $\Delta_1(\lambda)$, we should pay attention to $\|\lambda - s\lambda\|^2$ and the way that $\mu - \rho$ is conjugated to the dominant Weyl chamber. For convenience, we set

$$f(\lambda) := \|\lambda - s\lambda\|^2, \tag{16}$$

and

$$g(\lambda) := 2\langle\{\mu - \rho\} - (\mu - \rho), \rho\rangle. \tag{17}$$

Then as deduced above

$$\Delta_1(\lambda) = f(\lambda) - g(\lambda). \tag{18}$$

Lemma 3.2. *Fix an involution $s \in W$ such that $I(s)$ is empty. The function $f(\lambda)$ is a homogeneous quadratic polynomial in terms of λ_i, $1 \le i \le l$. Moreover, each term λ_i^2 has a positive coefficient, while each term $\lambda_i\lambda_j$, where $i \neq j$, has a nonnegative coefficient.*

Proof. Let $s = s_{\gamma_1} s_{\gamma_2} \cdots s_{\gamma_n}$ be any reduced decomposition of s into simple root reflections. Again, by Lemma 5.5 of [10],

$$\lambda - s\lambda = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \langle \lambda, \check{\gamma_k} \rangle \, s_{\gamma_1} s_{\gamma_2} \cdots s_{\gamma_{k-1}}(\gamma_k), \tag{19}$$

where $s_{\gamma_1} s_{\gamma_2} \cdots s_{\gamma_{k-1}}(\gamma_k)$ is a positive root for each k. Thus if we set

$$\lambda - s\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{l} \mu_i \alpha_i,$$

where $\mu_i = \sum_{j=1}^{l} a_{ij}\lambda_j$, then each coefficient a_{ij} is a nonnegative integer. Since the set $I(s)$ is empty by assumption, according to Lemma 3.1, the simple root α_i occurs at least once in the multi-set $\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \ldots, \gamma_n\}$. Let k be the smallest index such that $\gamma_k = \alpha_i$. Then the k-th term of the RHS of (19) is simply

$$s_{\gamma_1} s_{\gamma_2} \cdots s_{\gamma_{k-1}}(\alpha_i).$$

This term will contribute α_i to $\lambda - s\lambda$. Thus we actually have $a_{ii} > 0$.

To sum up, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\lambda - s\lambda\|^2 &= \|\lambda\|^2 + \|s\lambda\|^2 - 2\langle\lambda, s\lambda\rangle \\ &= 2\langle\lambda, \lambda - s\lambda\rangle \\ &= 2\langle\sum_i \lambda_i\varpi_i, \sum_i \mu_i\alpha_i\rangle \\ &= \sum_i \|\alpha_i\|^2\lambda_i\mu_i,\end{aligned}$$

where we use $\langle\varpi_i, \check{\alpha_j}\rangle = \delta_{ij}$ and $\alpha_i = \frac{\|\alpha_i\|^2}{2}\check{\alpha_i}$ at the penultimate step. Now the desired result follows since $\mu_i = \sum_j a_{ij}\lambda_j$. □

Lemma 3.3. *Fix an involution $s \in W$. The function $g(\lambda)$ is bounded over $\Lambda(s)$.*

Proof. Since $\{\mu - \rho\} - (\mu - \rho)$ is an $\mathbb{N}$-combination of simple roots, it follows that $g(\lambda)$ is lower bounded by 0. On the other hand, let $w \in W$ be such that $\{\mu - \rho\} = w(\mu - \rho)$, and let $w = s_{\gamma_1}\cdots s_{\gamma_n}$ be a reduced expression. Similar to Lemma 5.5 of [10], we have

$$\begin{aligned}\{\mu - \rho\} - (\mu - \rho) &= w(\mu - \rho) - (\mu - \rho) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{n}\langle\rho - \mu, \check{\gamma_k}\rangle\, s_{\gamma_1}s_{\gamma_2}\cdots s_{\gamma_{k-1}}(\gamma_k),\end{aligned}$$

where $s_{\gamma_1}s_{\gamma_2}\cdots s_{\gamma_{k-1}}(\gamma_k)$ is a positive root for each k. Since μ is dominant, we have

$$\langle\rho - \mu, \check{\gamma_k}\rangle \leq 1, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n.$$

Moreover, we have

$$\Phi(w^{-1}) = \left\{s_{\gamma_1}s_{\gamma_2}\cdots s_{\gamma_{k-1}}(\gamma_k) \mid 1 \leq k \leq n\right\}.$$

Here $\Phi(w^{-1}) := \{\alpha \in \Delta^+ \mid w^{-1}(\alpha) \in \Delta^-\}$. Therefore, to sum up,

$$0 \leq g(\lambda) \leq 2\sum_{\alpha\in\Phi(w^{-1})}\langle\rho, \alpha\rangle \leq \|2\rho\|^2.$$

□

3.4. **Proof of Theorem A.**

Proposition 3.4. *Fix an involution $s \in W$ such that $I(s)$ is empty. The there are at most finitely many unitary representations in the s-family.*

Proof. By Dirac inequality, the representation $J(\lambda, -s\lambda)$ is non-unitary whenever $\Delta_1(\lambda) > 0$. Now by (18), Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3, $\Delta_1(\lambda) \leq 0$ holds for at most finite points in $\Lambda(s)$. The result follows. □

Proposition 3.5. *Fix an involution $s \in W$ such that $I(s)$ is non-empty. Then this s-family either contains no representations in $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$, or it contains finitely many $I(s)$-strings of representations in $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$. In the latter case, the strings are all cohomologically induced from modules of $\widehat{L}_s^{\mathrm{d}}$ sitting in the s-family of L_s, and they are all in the good range. Here L_s is the Levi factor of the θ-stable parabolic subgroup P_s of G corresponding to the simple roots $\{\alpha_i \mid i \notin I(s)\}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{p}_s = \mathfrak{l}_s + \mathfrak{u}_s$ be the Levi decomposition of complexified Lie algebra of P_s. Put $S := \dim(\mathfrak{u}_s \cap \mathfrak{k})$. Suppose that this s-family contains members of $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$. Take such a representation $J(\lambda_0, -s\lambda_0)$ arbitrarily. Since $2\lambda_0$ is dominant integral and regular, we have

$$\langle \lambda_0, \alpha \rangle > 0, \quad \forall \alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{u}_s). \tag{20}$$

Thus the good range condition is met and by Theorem 2.3,

$$J(\lambda_0, -s\lambda_0) \cong \mathcal{L}_S(Z_{\lambda_0}),$$

where Z_{λ_0} is the irreducible unitary representation of L_s with Zhelobenko parameters

$$(\lambda_0 - \rho(\mathfrak{u}_s)/2, -s(\lambda_0 - \rho(\mathfrak{u}_s)/2)) = (\lambda_0 - \rho(\mathfrak{u}_s)/2, -s\lambda_0 + \rho(\mathfrak{u}_s)/2).$$

Namely, Z_{λ_0} has T-parameter $\lambda_0 + s\lambda_0 - \rho(\mathfrak{u}_s)$ and A-parameter $\lambda_0 - s\lambda_0$, respectively. Moreover, by Theorem 2.4, the inducing module Z_{λ_0} has non-zero Dirac cohomology.

Now take any λ in the $I(s)$-string where λ_0 sits in, i.e.,

$$\lambda - \lambda_0 = \sum_{i \in I(s)} a_i \varpi_i,$$

where $2a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Recalling the definition of $I(s)$ in (14) leads to

$$s(\lambda - \lambda_0) = \lambda - \lambda_0. \tag{21}$$

This time the good range condition is also met since

$$\langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle > 0, \quad \forall \alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{u}_s). \tag{22}$$

Thus by Theorem 2.3,

$$J(\lambda, -s\lambda) \cong \mathcal{L}_S(Z_\lambda),$$

where Z_λ is the irreducible representation of L_s with T-parameter $\lambda + s\lambda - \rho(\mathfrak{u}_s)$ and A-parameter $\lambda - s\lambda$.

By (21), we have

$$(\lambda + s\lambda - \rho(\mathfrak{u}_s)) - (\lambda_0 + s\lambda_0 - \rho(\mathfrak{u}_s)) = 2(\lambda - \lambda_0) = \sum_{i \in I(s)} 2a_i \varpi_i.$$

and

$$\lambda - s\lambda = \lambda_0 - s\lambda_0.$$

Hence Z_λ and Z_{λ_0} differ from each other by an integral central unitary character. Therefore, Z_λ is also unitary and it has non-zero Dirac cohomology as well. By Theorems 2.3 and 2.4, $J(\lambda, -s\lambda)$ is a member of $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$. We conclude that the entire $I(s)$-string where λ_0 lives in belong to $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$, and they are all in the good range.

To prove that there exist at most finitely many such $I(s)$-strings, it suffices to work on the s-family of L_s. Then on the L_s level, the set $I(s)$ becomes empty, and Proposition 3.4 applies. □

By the proof of Proposition 3.5, the string part of $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$ comes from the scattered parts of $\widehat{L}^{\mathrm{d}}_{\mathrm{ss}}$. Here $L \supseteq HA$ runs over the proper θ-stable Levi subgroups of G, and L_{ss} denotes its semisimple factor. Theorem A now follows from Propositions 3.4 and 3.5.

4. Certain families of representations

This section aims to study the Dirac cohomology of tempered representations, minimal representations and model representations.

4.1. **Tempered representations.**

Proposition 4.1. *Let G be a connected complex Lie group. Then the tempered representations with non-zero Dirac cohomology are precisely $J(\lambda,-\lambda)$, where 2λ is dominant integral and regular.*

Proof. By (12) and Theorem 2.1(c), it boils down to consider $J(\lambda,-\lambda)$, where 2λ is dominant integral and regular. Take any K-type δ in $J(\lambda,-\lambda)$. By Frobenius reciprocity, we have that $\delta-2\lambda$ is a positive integer combination of certain positive roots. Thus by (7), we have

$$\|\delta\|_{\text{spin}} \geq \|\delta\| \geq \|2\lambda\| = \|2\lambda\|_{\text{spin}}.$$

This shows that the spin norm of $J(\lambda,-\lambda)$ is $\|2\lambda\|$, and it is achieved only on the lowest K-type 2λ. Since 2λ is also the infinitesimal character of $J(\lambda,-\lambda)$, it follows from Proposition 2.5 that this representation has nonzero Dirac cohomology. □

Tempered representations with nonvanishing Dirac cohomology have been classified in [11] for real reductive Lie groups in Harish-Chandra class. Theorem 1.2 of [8] says that by taking the unique lowest K-type, these representations are in bijection with those K-types whose spin norm equal to their lambda norm. By the above proposition, we can write down this bijection explicitly for complex Lie groups:

$$J(\lambda,-\lambda) \longleftrightarrow 2\lambda. \tag{23}$$

4.2. **Minimal representations.**

The minimal representations $\pi_{\min}$ are those attached to the minimal nilpotent co-adjiont orbits of $\mathfrak{g}$. By [29], they are ladder representations. Namely, their K-types are multiplicity-free and form exactly the pencil $P(0)$. By [29] and [14], these representations are all unitary. The following table, which is based on Joseph [21], gives the parameters for them.

Type	$\lambda_L=\lambda_R$
A_{2n+1}	$\rho-\varpi_{n+1}$
A_{2n}	$\rho-\frac{1}{2}(\varpi_n+\varpi_{n+1})$
B_n	$\rho-\frac{1}{2}(\varpi_{n-2}+\varpi_{n-1})$
C_n	$\rho-\frac{1}{2}\varpi_n$
D_n	$\rho-\varpi_{n-2}$
E_6,E_7,E_8	$\rho-\varpi_4$
F_4	$\rho-\frac{1}{2}(\varpi_3+\varpi_4)$
G_2	$\rho-\frac{2}{3}\varpi_2$

Proposition 4.2. *Let G be a connected complex simple Lie group. Then the minimal representation of G has non-zero Dirac cohomology if and only if G is A_{2n}, B_n, C_{2n} or F_4.*

Proof. According to (12) and the above table, it suffices to consider A_{2n}, B_n, C_n and F_4. Denote by λ the parameters $\lambda_L=\lambda_R$ in the above table.

One calculates that $P_0 = \|n\beta\|_{\text{spin}} = \|2\lambda\|$ for A_{2n}, that $P_0 = \|(n-1)\beta\|_{\text{spin}} = \|2\lambda\|$ for B_n, that $P_0 = \|n\beta\|_{\text{spin}} = \|2\lambda\|$ for C_{2n}, and that $P_0 = \|4\beta\|_{\text{spin}} = \|2\lambda\|$ for F_4. Thus in all these cases $H_D(\pi_{\min}) \neq 0$ by Proposition 2.5.

For C_{2n-1}, we have $P_0 = \|n\beta\|_{\text{spin}} = \|(n-1)\beta\|_{\text{spin}} > \|2\lambda\|$. Thus $H_D(\pi_{\min})$ vanishes. □

4.3. **Model representations.** The model representations are $\pi_{\text{mod}} = J(\rho/2, \rho/2)$. By Theorem 2.1 of McGovern [24], $\pi_{\text{mod}}|_K$ is multiplicity-free and it consists exactly of those self-dual K-types δ such that δ lies in the root lattice. The following result is elementary.

Lemma 4.3. *Let G be a connected complex simple Lie group. Then ρ lies in the root lattice of G if and only if G is A_{2n}, C_{4n-1}, C_{4n}, D_{4n}, D_{4n+1}, G_2, F_4, E_6 or E_8.*

We remark that the model representation may or may not be unitary. For instance, it is unitary for G_2 and E_6, while not unitary for C_3, C_4 and F_4. Since $2\lambda = \rho$ for π_{mod}, whenever it is unitary, we have that $H_D(\pi_{\text{mod}})$ is non-zero if and only if ρ occurs as a K-type in π_{mod}. Since ρ is self-dual, the latter happens if and only if G is in the list of Lemma 4.3.

5. The spherical unitary dual

This section aims to study $\widehat{G}^{\text{sd}}$, the set of *non-trivial* representations with non-zero Dirac cohomology in the spherical unitary dual of G. We emphasize that since the trivial representation has been excluded, the set $\widehat{G}^{\text{sd}}$ could be empty. As we shall see, spherical representations live in the w_0-family.

5.1. **Reduction to finitely many candidates.** As mentioned earlier, for the study of Dirac cohomology, it suffices to consider

$$J(\lambda, -s\lambda)$$

where $s \in W$ is an involution, and 2λ is dominant integral and regular. This representation has lowest K-type $\{\lambda + s\lambda\}$. Thus for it to be spherical, we must have $s\lambda = -\lambda$. Since λ is regular, this forces $s = w_0$, the longest element of W. Indeed, take any positive root α, we have

$$\langle \lambda, s(\alpha) \rangle = \langle s\lambda, \alpha \rangle = \langle -\lambda, \alpha \rangle < 0.$$

Therefore, $s(\alpha)$ is a negative root. This shows that $s = w_0$. The following result is well-known, see [19].

Lemma 5.1. *Let G be a connected complex simple Lie group. Then $w_0 = -1$ if and only if G is A_1, B_n, C_n, D_{2n}, G_2, F_4, E_7 or E_8.*

Except for the trivial representation, any irreducible spherical unitary representation of G must be infinite dimensional. Thus by Proposition 2.6, it must contain $P(0)$, the pencil starting from the trivial K-type.

Thus in view of Proposition 2.5, we should have

$$\|2\lambda\| \leq P_0.$$

Moreover, there should exists a K-type δ in $J(\lambda, -s\lambda)$ such that

$$\{\delta - \rho\} + \rho = 2\lambda.$$

One sees easily that the LHS above equals $\delta + \sum_i n_i\alpha_i$, where n_i are some non-negative integers. By Frobenius reciprocity and the highest weight theorem, δ lies in the root lattice. We conclude that 2λ must lie in the root lattice.

To sum up, to find all the non-trivial representations with non-zero Dirac cohomology in the spherical unitary dual, it suffices to consider

$$J(\lambda, \lambda), \tag{24}$$

where 2λ is dominant integral and regular, and that

a) $\|2\lambda\| \leq P_0$;
b) 2λ lies in the root lattice;
c) $w_0\lambda = -\lambda$.

These requirements reduce the candidates to finitely many ones. The following table summarizes the information for some examples. Here the second row denotes the number of representations described in (24).

A_6	B_6	C_6	D_6	E_6	E_7	E_8	F_4	G_2
9	28	167	18	11	116	1080	8	2

The reduction above allows us to understand $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{sd}}$ on examples via using Atlas. We will simply refer to $J(\lambda, \lambda)$ by 2λ, which is expressed in terms of fundamental weights. That is, $2\lambda = [n_1, \cdots, n_l]$ means $2\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{l} n_i\varpi_i$.

5.2. **Classical groups.** Let us present our calculations for some classical groups.

Lemma 5.2. *We have the following.*

a) $\widehat{A}_n^{\mathrm{sd}}$ *is empty for* $n = 1, 3, 5$, *while* $\widehat{A}_2^{\mathrm{sd}} = \{[1, 1]\}$,

$$\widehat{A}_4^{\mathrm{sd}} = \{[1, 1, 1, 1], [2, 1, 1, 2]\},$$

and

$$\widehat{A}_6^{\mathrm{sd}} = \{[1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1], [2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2], [2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2]\}.$$

b) $\widehat{B}_3^{\mathrm{sd}} = \{\pi_{\min} = [1, 1, 2]\}$, $\widehat{B}_4^{\mathrm{sd}} = \{\pi_{\min} = [2, 1, 1, 2], [1, 1, 1, 2]\}$,

$$\widehat{B}_5^{\mathrm{sd}} = \{\pi_{\min} = [2, 2, 1, 1, 2], [1, 1, 1, 1, 2]\}.$$

and

$$\widehat{B}_6^{\mathrm{sd}} = \{\pi_{\min} = [2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2], [2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2], [1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2]\}.$$

c) $\widehat{C}_n^{\mathrm{sd}}$ *is empty for* $n = 3, 5$, *while* $\widehat{C}_n^{\mathrm{sd}} = \{\pi_{\min}\}$ *for* $n = 2, 4, 6$.
d) $\widehat{D}_n^{\mathrm{sd}} = \{\pi_{\mathrm{mod}}\}$ *for* $n = 4, 5$, *while* $\widehat{D}_6^{\mathrm{sd}} = \{[2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1]\}$.

All of them are K-multiplicity free.

We remark that all the representations in the above lemma are unipotent ones. Indeed, Section 5 of [5] offers excellent interpretations for them.

5.3. **Exceptional groups.**

Example 5.3. Let us consider G_2. In this case, there are two representations meeting the requirements of (24):

$$[1,1],[2,1].$$

Then Atlas calculates that the first representation is unitary, while the second one is not. Thus we conclude that $\widehat{G}_2^{\mathrm{sd}} = \{\pi_{\mathrm{mod}}\}$. □

Example 5.4. Let us consider F_4. In this case, there are eight representations meeting the requirements of (24):

$$\begin{array}{llll}[2,2,1,1], & [1,2,1,1], & [2,1,1,1], & [2,1,1,2],\\ [1,1,2,1], & [1,1,1,2], & [1,1,1,1], & [3,1,1,1].\end{array}$$

By Proposition 4.2, $[2,2,1,1]$ is the minimal representation and has non-zero Dirac cohomology. Atlas calculates that the seven remaining representations are not unitary. We conclude that $\widehat{F}_4^{\mathrm{sd}} = \{\pi_{\mathrm{min}}\}$. □

Example 5.5. Let us consider E_6. In this case, there are eleven representations meeting the requirements of (24). Among them, $[1,1,1,1,1,1]$ stands for the model representation, and it has non-zero Dirac cohomology by the discussion in §4.3. Atlas calculates the K-types pattern of the other ten representations, and we deduce from Parthasarathy's Dirac inequality that they are not unitary. Details are given in the following table.

2λ	K-type δ
$[1,1,2,1,2,1]$	$[1,0,0,1,0,1]$
$[1,4,1,1,1,1]$	$[1,1,0,0,0,1]$
$[3,1,1,1,1,3]$	$[1,1,0,0,0,1]$
$[1,2,1,2,1,1]$	$[1,1,0,0,0,1]$
$[2,1,1,2,1,2]$	$[1,0,1,1,0,0]$
$[1,2,1,1,1,1]$	$[1,0,1,1,1,1]$
$[2,2,1,1,1,2]$	$[0,0,1,0,1,0]$
$[2,1,1,1,1,2]$	$[1,0,1,0,1,1]$
$[1,1,1,2,1,1]$	$[1,1,1,1,0,0]$
$[1,3,1,1,1,1]$	$[1,0,1,1,0,0]$

The second column of the table above specifies a K-type δ in $J(\lambda,\lambda)$ such that

$$P_\delta < \|2\lambda\|.$$

We conclude that $\widehat{E}_6^{\mathrm{sd}} = \{\pi_{\mathrm{mod}}\}$. □

5.4. **A conjecture.** The previous calculation leads us to make the following.

Conjecture 5.6. *The set $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{sd}}$ can be described as follows.*

a) *$\widehat{A}_{2n-1}^{\mathrm{sd}}$ is empty, while $\widehat{A}_{2n}^{\mathrm{sd}}$ consists of the following n representations:*

$$[\underbrace{2,\dots,2}_{p},\underbrace{1,\dots,1}_{2n-2p},\underbrace{2,\dots,2}_{p}],\quad 1\le p\le n.$$

b) $\widehat{B}_n^{\mathrm{sd}}$ *consists of the following* $[\frac{n}{2}]$ *representations:*

$$[\underbrace{2,\dots,2}_{p(a,b)},\ \underbrace{1,\dots,1}_{n-p(a,b)-1},\ 2],$$

where $a+b=n$, $b\geq a\geq 1$, *and* $p(a,b):=\max\{b-a-1,0\}$.

c) $\widehat{C}_{2n-1}^{\mathrm{sd}}$ *is empty, while* $\widehat{C}_{2n}^{\mathrm{sd}}=\{\pi_{\min}\}$, *where* $\pi_{\min}$ *stands for the minimal representation.*

d) $\widehat{D}_n^{\mathrm{sd}}$ *consists of the following* $[\frac{n}{4}]$ *representations:*

$$[\underbrace{2,\dots,2}_{p(a,b)},\underbrace{1,\dots,1}_{n-p(a,b)}],$$

where $a+b=n$, $b\geq a\geq 2$, a *is even, and* $p(a,b):=\max\{b-a-1,0\}$.

In particular, any representation in $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{sd}}$ *is* K*-multiplicity free.*

Thanks to the work carried out in Section 5 of [5], all the representations above are unipotent ones with non-zero Dirac cohomology, and all of them are K-multiplicity free. Thus the hard part of the conjecture is to show that these representations *exhaust* the set $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{sd}}$. That is, $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{sd}}$ should contain no other representation. Although the unitary dual of classical complex Lie groups has been described by Vogan [31] and Barbasch [4], this still seems to be rather non-trivial (for the authors). For exceptional groups, we would like to guess that $\widehat{E}_7^{\mathrm{sd}}$ is empty, while $\widehat{E}_8^{\mathrm{sd}}=\{\pi_{\mathrm{mod}}\}$.

6. A computing method

This section aims to introduce a method that allows us to compute all the members of $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$ in any s-family such that $I(s)$ is empty. Thus by Proposition 3.5, eventually we can compute the entire $\widehat{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$. Our basic idea is to use Parthasarathy's Dirac inequality and Vogan pencil. More precisely, we proceed as follows:

- calculate the lowest K-type $\mu:=\{\lambda+s\lambda\}$ for $J(\lambda,-s\lambda)$.
- when λ is large, calculate

$$\Delta_1(\lambda):=\|2\lambda\|^2-\|\mu\|^2_{\mathrm{spin}}. \tag{25}$$

- when λ is small, calculate

$$\Delta_2(\lambda):=\|2\lambda\|^2-P_\mu^2. \tag{26}$$

Here P_μ is the minimal spin norm of the K-types lying on $P(\mu)$, the Vogan pencil starting from μ, see (9). Note that $\Delta_2(\lambda)$ sharpens $\Delta_1(\lambda)$ whenever μ is u-small, see (11). We call them *discriminants* for λ. Whenever either discriminant is positive, the representation $J(\lambda,-s\lambda)$ is non-unitary. To have more flexibility, we shall just leave the precise description of "large" and "small" blank. However, looking at the boundary of the u-small convex hull is always helpful.

Since $I(s)$ is empty, Proposition 3.4 guarantees that we are left with at most finitely many candidate representations. Then by Atlas [2], one can eventually handle them completely.

Let us illustrate this method carefully for G_2, whose unitary dual is determined by Duflo [12] in 1979. We adopt α_1 as the short simple root, while α_2 is long. There are eight involutions for G_2. Let $\lambda = [a, b]$, where $a, b \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}$. We have the following table.

Involution s	$\lambda + s\lambda$	$I(s)$
e	$[2a, 2b]$	$\{1, 2\}$
s_1	$[0, a + 2b]$	$\{2\}$
s_2	$[2a + 3b, 0]$	$\{1\}$
$s_1s_2s_1$	$[-a - 3b, a + 3b]$	$\emptyset$
$s_2s_1s_2$	$[3a + 3b, -a - b]$	$\emptyset$
$s_1s_2s_1s_2s_1$	$[-3b, 2b]$	$\emptyset$
$s_2s_1s_2s_1s_2$	$[2a, -a]$	$\emptyset$
w_0	$[0, 0]$	$\emptyset$

The three s-families where $I(s)$ are non-empty can be handled easily: it boils down to work on the s-family of the corresponding Levi factors. The w_0-family has been considered in Example 5.3. Let us focus on the four remaining s-families one by one.

For $s = s_2s_1s_2s_1s_2$, we have $\mu = [a, 0]$. Therefore, a must be a positive integer. When $a \geq 4$, we have $\{\mu - \rho\} = [a - 4, 1]$. Then

$$\Delta_1(\lambda) = 6a^2 + 24ab + 24b^2 - 6 > 0.$$

Thus these representations are not unitary. One can also calculate that

$$\Delta_2(\lambda) = \begin{cases} 24b^2 + 72b + 30 & \text{if } a = 3; \\ 24b^2 + 48b + 6 & \text{if } a = 2; \\ 24b^2 + 24b - 6 & \text{if } a = 1, \end{cases}$$

which is always positive. Thus the corresponding representations are not unitary either.

For $s = s_1s_2s_1s_2s_1$, we have $\mu = [0, b]$. Therefore, b must be a positive integer. When $b \geq 2$, we have $\{\mu - \rho\} = [1, b - 2]$. Then

$$\Delta_1(\lambda) = 8a^2 + 24ab + 18b^2 - 2 > 0.$$

Thus these representations are not unitary. When $b = 1$, one can also calculate that

$$\Delta_2(\lambda) = 8a^2 + 24a - 2 > 0.$$

Thus these representations are not unitary either.

For $s = s_1s_2s_1$, we have $\mu = [a + 3b, 0]$. Therefore, $a + 3b$ must be an integer. When $a + 3b \geq 4$, we have $\{\mu - \rho\} = [a + 3b - 4, 1]$. Then

$$\Delta_1(\lambda) = 6a^2 + 12ab + 6b^2 - 6 > 0.$$

Thus these representations are not unitary. When $a + 3b < 4$, then we must have $a = 3/2$ and $b = 1/2$, or $a = b = 1/2$. Thus it remains to consider the representations

$$J([3/2, 1/2], [9/2, -5/2]), \quad J([1/2, 1/2], [5/2, -3/2]).$$

They are not unitary by Atlas.

For $s = s_2s_1s_2$, we have $\mu = [0, a + b]$. When $a + b \geq 2$, we have $\{\mu - \rho\} = [1, a + b - 2]$. Then

$$\Delta_1(\lambda) = 2a^2 + 12ab + 18b^2 - 2 > 0.$$

Thus these representations are not unitary. When $a+b=1$, we must have $a=b=1/2$, and the representation is

$$J([1/2,1/2],[-5/2,3/2]).$$

It is non-unitary by Atlas.

To sum up, the set $\widehat{G}_2^{\mathrm{d}}$ is pinned down as follows, where $a,b\in\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}$. Note that it consists of two scattered members and three strings. Note also that the last row in Table 1 is the trivial representation, while the penultimate row is the model representation.

TABLE 1. The set $\widehat{G}_2^{\mathrm{d}}$

s	λ	spin LKT	mult
e	$[a,b]$	LKT	1
s_1	$[1,b]$	LKT	1
s_2	$[a,1]$	LKT	1
w_0	$\rho/2$	ρ	1
w_0	ρ	$[0,0]$	1

7. The string part of $\widehat{F}_4^{\mathrm{d}}$

From now on, we set G to be complex F_4, whose Dynkin diagram is adopted as follows, where α_1 and α_2 are short, while α_3 and α_4 are long, see page 691 of Knapp [22] for more.



There are 140 involutions in W, which are indexed in the Appendix. Thus we will freely refer to an involution by its index there. This section aims to figure out the string part of $\widehat{F}_4^{\mathrm{d}}$. Namely, we shall consider the 37 involutions where $I(s)$ are non-empty. Guided by Proposition 3.5, finding members of $\widehat{F}_4^{\mathrm{d}}$ in such an s-family boils down to finding the members of $\widehat{L}_s^{\mathrm{d}}$ in the s-family of L_s. Since the Levi factor L_s is always classical, getting the string part of $\widehat{F}_4^{\mathrm{d}}$ is relatively easier than getting its scattered part. Let us see an example.

Example 7.1. Consider the involution s with index 15, i.e., $s=s_2s_1s_3s_2$. Then $I(s)=\{4\}$. Let P_s be the θ-stable parabolic subgroup of complex F_4 corresponding to the simple roots α_1, α_2 and α_3. Let L_s be its Levi subgroup. The semisimple part of L_s is complex C_3, and one calculates that in the s-family of C_3, there is only one unitary representation having non-zero Dirac cohomology:

$$J([2,-2,2],[-1,3,-1]).$$

Namely, it is $J(\lambda_s,-s\lambda_s)$ for C_3, where $\lambda_s=[1/2,1/2,1/2]$. Moreover, $2\lambda_s$ is its unique spin lowest K-type occurring with multiplicity one. Therefore, the module cohomologically induced from the above representation sits in the $I(s)$-family $\lambda=[1/2,1/2,1/2,d]$, where d runs over $\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}$. Moreover, 2λ is the unique spin lowest K-type of $J(\lambda,-s\lambda)$ and it occurs exactly once. □

Other s-families are handled similarly. The final result is presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2. The string part of $\widehat{F}_4^{\mathrm{d}}$

$\#s$	λ	spin LKT	mult
1	$[a,b,c,d]$	LKT	1
2	$[1,b,c,d]$	LKT	1
3	$[a,1,c,d]$	LKT	1
4	$[a,b,1,d]$	LKT	1
5	$[a,b,c,1]$	LKT	1
6	$[1,b,1,d]$	LKT	1
7	$[1,b,c,1]$	LKT	1
8	$[a,1,c,1]$	LKT	1
9	$[1/2,1/2,c,d]$	2λ	1
9	$[1,1,c,d]$	LKT	1
10	$[a,1/2,1/2,d]$	2λ	1
12	$[a,b,1/2,1/2]$	2λ	1
12	$[a,b,1,1]$	LKT	1
13	$[1/2,1/2,c,1]$	$[1,1,2c+1,0]$	1
13	$[1,1,c,1]$	LKT	1
14	$[1,b,1/2,1/2]$	$[0,2b+1,1,1]$	1
14	$[1,b,1,1]$	LKT	1
15	$[1/2,1/2,1/2,d]$	2λ	1
16	$[a,1,1,d]$	LKT	1
16	$[a,1,1/2,d]$	$[2a+1,2,0,2d+1]$	1
20	$[a,1/2,1/2,1]$	$[2a,3,0,1]$	1
23	$[1/2,1/2,1,d]$	$[3,1,0,2d+2]$	1
23	$[1/2,1/2,1/2,d]$	2λ	1
27	$[a,1,1/2,1/2]$	$[2a+2,0,1,2]$	1
33	$[a,1/2,1/2,1/2]$	2λ	1
34	$[1,1,1/2,d]$	$[3,0,0,2d+3]$	1
34	$[1,1/2,1/2,d]$	$[1,2,0,2d+1]$	1
47	$[1,1,1,d]$	LKT	1
50	$[a,1,1,1]$	LKT	1
50	$[a,1,1/2,1/2]$	$[2a+2,0,2,0]$	1

8. THE SCATTERED PART OF $\widehat{F}_4^{\mathrm{d}}$

In this section, we use $\lambda=[a,b,c,d]$ to denote the weight $a\varpi_1+b\varpi_2+c\varpi_3+d\varpi_4$, where $a,b,c,d\in\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}$. Set $\mu:=\{\lambda+s\lambda\}$, which is the lowest K-type of $J(\lambda,-s\lambda)$. Let us focus on the 103 s-families where $I(s)$ are empty. To use the two discriminants $\Delta_1(\lambda)$ and $\Delta_2(\lambda)$ efficiently, we shall arrange these s-families according to their types, and each type essentially bears a common pattern. We will provide the common pattern for each type, and give a few examples.

The final result is presented in Table 3. We note that according to page 13 of [5], there are ten representations in $\widehat{F}_4^{\mathrm{d}}$ with $\lambda=\rho/2$: three of them appear in Table 3, while the other

TABLE 3. The scattered part of $\widehat{F}_4^{\mathrm{d}}$

$\#s$	λ	spin LKT	mult	u-small
25	$[1/2,1/2,1/2,1]$	$[1,3,0,1]$	1	Yes
38	$\rho/2$	ρ	1	Yes
62	$[1,1,1/2,1/2]$	$[0,0,1,4]$	1	Yes
63	$[1/2,1/2,1,1]$	$[7,1,0,0]$	1	Yes
63	$\rho/2$	ρ	1	Yes
76	$[1,1/2,1/2,1]$	$[4,2,0,0]$	1	Yes
92	$[1,1/2,1/2,1/2]$	$[2,2,0,1]$	1	Yes
122	$\rho/2$	ρ	1	Yes
140	$[1,1,1/2,1/2]$	$[0,0,0,4]$	1	Yes
140	ρ	$[0,0,0,0]$	1	Yes

ones are merged into seven strings in Table 2. Note also that the last row of Table 3 is the trivial representation, and the penultimate row there is the minimal representation.

8.1. **Type** (1)**.** There are eleven involutions such that $\mu = x\varpi_1$ for any λ, where $x \in \mathbb{P}$. We call these s-families have type (1), and adopt the following common pattern to handle them.

(a) calculate $\Delta_1(\lambda)$ for $x \geq 10$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [x-9,2,2,2]$.
(b) calculate $\Delta_2(\lambda)$ for the nine (possible) remaining points:

$$x = 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9.$$

Type	#s
(1)	63, 76, 92, 109, 110, 120, 122, 130, 132, 138, 139

We give a concrete example to illustrate the above pattern.

Example 8.1. Let us consider the involution s with index 63. Then

$$\mu = [a+3b+4c+2d, 0, 0, 0].$$

Thus $x = a+3b+4c+2d \geq 5$. When $x \geq 10$, we have

$$\Delta_1(\lambda) = \frac{1}{3}x^2 + \frac{4}{3}ax + \left(\frac{4}{3}a^2 + \frac{8}{3}c^2 + \frac{8}{3}cd + \frac{8}{3}d^2\right) - 35.$$

The term in the bracket takes the minimal value $\frac{7}{3}$ when $a = c = d = \frac{1}{2}$. It is then easy to see that $\Delta_1(\lambda) > 0$ when $x \geq 10$. Now it remains to calculate $\Delta_2(\lambda)$ for $x = 5,6,7,8,9$. We only present the discussion for $x = 5,8$. In the former case, we must have $\lambda = \rho/2$, and it is in $\widehat{F}_4^{\mathrm{d}}$. When $x = 8$, we can have $c = 1/2$ or 1. A little more calculation gives that λ has seven choices in total, and $\Delta_2(\lambda) > 0$ fails exactly in the following cases:

$$\lambda = [1/2,1/2,1,1], \quad [1,1,1/2,1], \quad [1/2,3/2,1/2,1/2].$$

Atlas says that the first representation is unitary, while the other two are not. Then a closer look at the first representation says that it has a unique spin lowest K-type $[7,1,0,0]$, which occurs with multiplicity one. Thus $J(\lambda, -s\lambda) \in \widehat{F}_4^{\mathrm{d}}$ for $\lambda = [1/2,1/2,1,1]$. □

8.2. **Type** (4)**.** There are eleven non-dominant involutions such that $\mu = x\varpi_4$ for any λ, where $x \in \mathbb{P}$. We call these s-families have type (4), and adopt the following common pattern to handle them.

(a) calculate $\Delta_1(\lambda)$ for $x \geq 7$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [2, 2, 2, x - 6]$.
(b) calculate $\Delta_2(\lambda)$ for the six (possible) remaining points:

$$x = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.$$

Type	#s
(4)	62, 77, 93, 108, 111, 121, 123, 129, 131, 136, 137

8.3. **Type** (13)**.** There are thirteen involutions such that $\mu = x\varpi_1 + y\varpi_3$ for any λ, where $x, y \in \mathbb{P}$. We call these s-families have type (13), and adopt the following common pattern to handle them.

(a) calculate $\Delta_1(\lambda)$ for the following (possible) cases:
- $x \geq 2$ and $y \geq 3$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [x - 1, 2, y - 2, 2]$.
- $x = 1$ and $y \geq 3$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [2, 1, y - 2, 2]$.
- $x \geq 3$ and $y = 2$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [x - 2, 2, 1, 1]$.
- $x \geq 6$ and $y = 1$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [x - 5, 2, 1, 2]$.

(b) calculate $\Delta_2(\lambda)$ for the seven (possible) remaining points:

$$(x, y) = (1, 1), (2, 1), (3, 1), (4, 1), (5, 1), (1, 2), (2, 2).$$

Type	#s
(13)	29, 37, 43, 51, 53, 54, 66, 67, 82, 83, 101, 102, 112

8.4. **Type** (23)**.** For the involution with index 60 we have that $\mu = x\varpi_2 + y\varpi_3$ for any λ, where $x, y \in \mathbb{P}$. We call it has type (23), and adopt the following pattern to handle it.

(a) calculate $\Delta_1(\lambda)$ for the following (possible) cases:
- $x \geq 2$ and $y \geq 2$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [2, x - 1, y - 1, 2]$.
- $x = 1$ and $y \geq 3$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [1, 2, y - 2, 2]$.
- $x \geq 4$ and $y = 1$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [2, x - 3, 2, 1]$.

(b) calculate $\Delta_2(\lambda)$ for the four (possible) remaining points:

$$(x, y) = (1, 1), (2, 1), (3, 1), (1, 2).$$

8.5. **Type** (24)**.** There are eleven involutions such that $\mu = x\varpi_2 + y\varpi_4$ for any λ, where $x, y \in \mathbb{P}$. We call these s-families have type (24), and adopt the following common pattern to handle them.

(a) calculate $\Delta_1(\lambda)$ for the following (possible) cases:
- $x \geq 4$ and $y \geq 2$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [2, x - 3, 2, y - 1]$.
- $x \geq 4$ and $y = 1$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [2, x - 3, 1, 2]$.
- $x = 3$ and $y \geq 2$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [1, 2, 1, y - 1]$.
- $x = 2$ and $y \geq 3$, then$\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [1, 2, 1, y - 2]$.
- $x = 1$ and $y \geq 5$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [2, 1, 2, y - 4]$.

(b) calculate $\Delta_2(\lambda)$ for the seven (possible) remaining points:

$$(x, y) = (1, 1), (1, 2), (1, 3), (1, 4), (2, 1), (2, 2), (3, 1).$$

Type	#s
(24)	46, 55, 59, 61, 70, 75, 85, 88, 99, 106, 119

8.6. **Type** (14)**.** There are thirteen involutions such that $\mu = x\varpi_1 + y\varpi_4$ for any λ, where $x, y \in \mathbb{P}$. We call these s-families have type (14), and adopt the following common pattern to handle them.

(a) calculate $\Delta_1(\lambda)$ for the following (possible) cases:
- $x \geq 5$ and $y \geq 4$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [x-4, 2, 2, y-3]$.
- $x = 4$ and $y \geq 4$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [2, 1, 2, y-3]$.
- $x = 3$ and $y \geq 4$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [2, 2, 1, y-3]$.
- $x = 2$ and $y \geq 5$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [2, 1, 2, y-4]$.
- $x = 1$ and $y \geq 6$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [1, 2, 2, y-5]$.
- $x \geq 5$ and $y = 3$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [x-4, 2, 1, 2]$.
- $x \geq 6$ and $y = 2$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [x-5, 2, 1, 2]$.
- $x \geq 8$ and $y = 1$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [x-7, 2, 2, 1]$.

(b) calculate $\Delta_2(\lambda)$ for the nineteen (possible) remaining points:

$$(x,1), 1 \leq x \leq 7; (x,2), 1 \leq x \leq 5; (x,3), 1 \leq x \leq 4; (x,4), 1 \leq x \leq 2; (1,5).$$

Type	#s
(14)	38, 52, 57, 69, 72, 84, 89, 96, 103, 107, 114, 118, 125

8.7. **Type** (134)**.** For the involution with index 11 we have that $\mu = x\varpi_1 + y\varpi_3 + z\varpi_4$ for any λ, where $x, y, z \in \mathbb{P}$. We call this s-family has type (134), and adopt the following common pattern to handle it.

(a) calculate $\Delta_1(\lambda)$ for the following (possible) cases:
- $x \geq 2$ and $y \geq 2$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [x-1, 2, y-1, z]$.
- $x \geq 3$, $y = 1$ and $z \geq 2$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [x-2, 2, 1, z-1]$.
- $x \geq 4$, $y = 1$ and $z = 1$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [x-3, 2, 1, 1]$.
- $x = 1$, $y \geq 2$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [2, 1, y-1, z]$.
- $x = 2$, $y = 1$ and $z \geq 2$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [2, 1, 1, z-1]$.
- $x = 1$, $y = 1$ and $z \geq 3$, then $\{\mu - \rho\} + \rho = [1, 2, 1, z-2]$.

(b) calculate $\Delta_2(\lambda)$ for the four (possible) remaining points:

$$(x,y,z) = (1,1,1), (1,1,2), (2,1,1), (3,1,1).$$

8.8. **Type** $(\pm \mp 3)$**.** There are ten involutions such that μ is conjugate to $x\varpi_1 - x\varpi_2 + y\varpi_3$ for any λ, where $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $y \in \mathbb{P}$. We call these s-families have type $(\pm \mp 3)$. Whenever $x = 0$, they will be of type (3); whenever $x > 0$, they will be of type (23); and whenever $x < 0$, they will be of type (13).

Type	#s
$(\pm \mp 3)$	39, 41, 58, 68, 74, 80, 87, 95, 98, 113

8.9. **Type** $(\pm \mp 34)$**.** There are five involutions such that μ is conjugate to $x\varpi_1 - x\varpi_2 + y\varpi_3 + z\varpi_4$ for any λ, where $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $y, z \in \mathbb{P}$. We call these s-families have type $(\pm \mp 34)$. Whenever $x = 0$, they will be of type (34); whenever $x > 0$, they will be of type (234); and whenever $x < 0$, they will be of type (134).

Type	#s
$(\pm\mp 34)$	31, 49, 65, 78, 91

8.10. **Type** $(2\pm\mp)$**.** There are eleven involutions such that μ is conjugate to $x\varpi_2+y\varpi_3-y\varpi_4$ for any λ, where $x\in\mathbb{P}$ and $y\in\mathbb{Z}$. We call these s-families have type $(2\pm\mp)$. Whenever $y=0$, they will be of type (2); whenever $y>0$, they will be of type (24); and whenever $y<0$, they will be of type (23).

Type	#s
$(2\pm\mp)$	25, 35, 44, 56, 71, 73, 86, 90, 104, 105, 115

8.11. **Type** $(12\pm\mp)$**.** There are four involutions such that μ is conjugate to $x\varpi_1+y\varpi_2+z\varpi_3-z\varpi_4$ for any λ, where $x,y\in\mathbb{P}$ and $z\in\mathbb{Z}$. We call these s-families have type $(12\pm\mp)$. Whenever $z=0$, they will be of type (12); whenever $z>0$, they will be of type (124); and whenever $z<0$, they will be of type (123).

Type	#s
$(12\pm\mp)$	30, 48, 79, 94

8.12. **Remaining** s**-families.** There are twelve involutions whose types are no longer easily identified as above ones. Their indices are

$$81, 97, 100, 116, 117, 124, 126, 127, 128, 133, 134, 135.$$

However, we can still handle them: there are just more cases. We illustrate the situation with an example.

Example 8.2. Let us consider the involution s with index 100. One calculates that there are five cases:

- $a>2d$, then $\mu=[a-2d,0,b+c+d,0]$ is of type (13).
- $a=2d$, then $\mu=[0,0,b+c+d,0]$ is of type (3).
- $d-b-c<a<2d$, then $\mu=[0,2d-a,a+b+c-d,0]$ is of type (23).
- $a=d-b-c$, then $\mu=[0,a+2b+2c,0,0]$ is of type (2).
- $a<d-b-c$, then $\mu=[0,a+2b+2c,0,d-a-b-c]$ is of type (24).

Then for each case we can use the techniques from previous subsections. Finally, we know that there is no unitary representation in this s-family. □

9. Appendix

In this appendix, we index all the involutions s in the Weyl group of F_4 by presenting the weight $s\rho$.

Index	$s\rho$	Index	$s\rho$	Index	$s\rho$
1	$[1,1,1,1]$	2	$[-1,2,1,1]$	3	$[2,-1,2,1]$
4	$[1,3,-1,2]$	5	$[1,1,2,-1]$	6	$[-1,4,-1,2]$
7	$[-1,2,2,-1]$	8	$[2,-1,3,-1]$	9	$[-1,-1,3,1]$
10	$[5,-3,1,3]$	11	$[4,1,-2,4]$	12	$[1,5,-1,-1]$
13	$[-1,-1,4,-1]$	14	$[-1,6,-1,-1]$	15	$[3,-5,3,3]$
16	$[5,-1,-1,4]$	17	$[4,5,-4,2]$	18	$[-5,1,1,4]$
19	$[-3,5,-3,5]$	20	$[7,-5,4,-2]$	21	$[6,1,1,-4]$
22	$[-4,-1,2,4]$	23	$[-5,3,-1,5]$	24	$[-3,9,-5,3]$
25	$[5,-7,6,-2]$	26	$[10,-5,1,1]$	27	$[7,-1,2,-4]$
28	$[1,1,-3,7]$	29	$[6,3,-1,-3]$	30	$[-7,1,5,-3]$
31	$[-5,7,1,-5]$	32	$[1,-4,1,6]$	33	$[9,1,-3,1]$
34	$[-1,-3,1,6]$	35	$[-6,-1,6,-3]$	36	$[-2,1,-2,7]$
37	$[-11,5,1,1]$	38	$[-7,5,3,-5]$	39	$[-5,9,-1,-4]$
40	$[1,-2,-1,7]$	41	$[7,-10,4,3]$	42	$[10,-1,-2,1]$
43	$[10,-3,1,-2]$	44	$[5,5,-7,5]$	45	$[9,1,-2,-1]$
46	$[1,1,4,-8]$	47	$[-1,-1,-1,7]$	48	$[-9,11,-4,1]$
49	$[1,-6,8,-6]$	50	$[10,-1,-1,-1]$	51	$[-7,-4,5,2]$
52	$[-1,-5,8,-6]$	53	$[-11,9,-2,1]$	54	$[-11,7,1,-2]$
55	$[-2,1,5,-8]$	56	$[-6,11,-7,4]$	57	$[-9,11,-3,-1]$
58	$[5,-10,8,-4]$	59	$[1,-2,6,-8]$	60	$[9,-4,-3,6]$
61	$[3,7,-3,-5]$	62	$[-1,-1,6,-8]$	63	$[-11,9,-1,-1]$
64	$[1,-11,7,1]$	65	$[1,10,-8,1]$	66	$[-1,-10,7,1]$
67	$[-5,-6,8,-3]$	68	$[-9,6,-4,6]$	69	$[-1,11,-8,1]$
70	$[-4,11,-4,-4]$	71	$[4,-11,4,4]$	72	$[1,-11,8,-1]$
73	$[9,-6,4,-6]$	74	$[5,6,-8,3]$	75	$[1,10,-7,-1]$
76	$[-1,-10,8,-1]$	77	$[-1,11,-7,-1]$	78	$[11,-9,1,1]$
79	$[1,1,-6,8]$	80	$[-3,-7,3,5]$	81	$[-9,4,3,-6]$
82	$[-1,2,-6,8]$	83	$[-5,10,-8,4]$	84	$[9,-11,3,1]$
85	$[6,-11,7,-4]$	86	$[2,-1,-5,8]$	87	$[11,-7,-1,2]$
88	$[11,-9,2,-1]$	89	$[1,5,-8,6]$	90	$[7,4,-5,-2]$
91	$[-10,1,1,1]$	92	$[-1,6,-8,6]$	93	$[9,-11,4,-1]$
94	$[1,1,1,-7]$	95	$[-1,-1,-4,8]$	96	$[-9,-1,2,1]$
97	$[-5,-5,7,-5]$	98	$[-10,3,-1,2]$	99	$[-10,1,2,-1]$
100	$[-7,10,-4,-3]$	101	$[-1,2,1,-7]$	102	$[5,-9,1,4]$
103	$[7,-5,-3,5]$	104	$[11,-5,-1,-1]$	105	$[2,-1,2,-7]$
106	$[6,1,-6,3]$	107	$[1,3,-1,-6]$	108	$[-9,-1,3,-1]$
109	$[-1,4,-1,-6]$	110	$[5,-7,-1,5]$	111	$[7,-1,-5,3]$
112	$[-6,-3,1,3]$	113	$[-1,-1,3,-7]$	114	$[-7,1,-2,4]$
115	$[-10,5,-1,-1]$	116	$[-5,7,-6,2]$	117	$[3,-9,5,-3]$
118	$[5,-3,1,-5]$	119	$[4,1,-2,-4]$	120	$[-6,-1,-1,4]$
121	$[-7,5,-4,2]$	122	$[3,-5,3,-5]$	123	$[5,-1,-1,-4]$
124	$[-4,-5,4,-2]$	125	$[-5,1,1,-4]$	126	$[-3,5,-3,-3]$
127	$[1,-6,1,1]$	128	$[1,1,-4,1]$	129	$[-1,-5,1,1]$
130	$[-4,-1,2,-4]$	131	$[-5,3,-1,-3]$	132	$[1,1,-3,-1]$
133	$[-2,1,-3,1]$	134	$[1,-2,-2,1]$	135	$[1,-4,1,-2]$
136	$[-1,-1,-2,1]$	137	$[-1,-3,1,-2]$	138	$[-2,1,-2,-1]$
139	$[1,-2,-1,-1]$	140	$[-1,-1,-1,-1]$		

References

[1] J. Adams, M. van Leeuwen, P. Trapa and D. Vogan, *Unitary representations of real reductive groups*, preprint, 2012 (arXiv:1212.2192).

[2] Atlas, version 0.7, see www.liegroups.org for more about the software, December 2016.

[3] M. Atiyah, W. Schmid, *A geometric construction of the discrete series for semisimple Lie groups*, Invent. Math. **42** (1977), 1–62. Erratum: Invent. Math. **54** (1979), 189–192.

[4] D. Barbasch, *The unitary dual of complex classicial Lie groups*, Invent. Math. **96** (1989), 103–176.

[5] D. Barbasch, P. Pandžić, *Dirac cohomology and unipotent representations of complex groups*, Noncommutative geometry and global analysis, 1–22, Contemp. Math., 546, Amer. Math. Soc., 2011.

[6] D. Barbasch, P. Pandžić, *Dirac cohomology of unipotent representations of $Sp(2n, \mathbb{R})$ and $U(p, q)$*. J. Lie Theory **25** (2015), 185–213.

[7] C.-P. Dong, *On the Dirac cohomology of complex Lie group representations*, Transform. Groups **18** (2013), 61–79. Erratum: Transform. Groups **18** (2013), 595–597.

[8] J. Ding, C.-P. Dong, *Spin norm, K-types, and tempered representations*, J. Lie Theory **26** (2016), 651–658.

[9] C.-P. Dong, *Spin norm, pencils, and the u-small convex hull*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **144** (2016), 999–1013.

[10] C.-P. Dong, J.-S. Huang, *Jqcquet modules and Dirac cohomology*, Adv. Math. **226** (2011), 2911–2934.

[11] C.-P. Dong, J.-S. Huang, *Dirac cohomology of cohomologically induced modules for reductive Lie groups*, Amer. J. Math. **137** (2015), 37–60.

[12] M. Duflo, *Réprésentations unitaires irréductibles des groupes semi-simples complexes de rang deux*, Bull. Soc. Math. Fr. **107** (1979), 55–96.

[13] T. Enright, R. Howe, N. Wallach, *A classification of unitary highest weight modules*, Representation theory of reductive groups (Park City, Utah, 1982), Progr. Math. Vol. **40**, Boston, MA, 1983, pp. 97–143.

[14] J.-S. Huang, *Minimal representations, shared orbits, and dual pair correspondences*, IMRN (1995), 309–323.

[15] J.-S. Huang, private communication, 2010.

[16] J.-S. Huang, *Dirac cohomology, elliptic representations and endoscopy*, Representations of reductive groups, Progr. Math. **312** (2015), 241–276.

[17] J.-S. Huang, P. Pandžić, *Dirac cohomology, unitary representations and a proof of a conjecture of Vogan*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **15** (2002), 185–202.

[18] J.-S. Huang, Y.-F. Kang, P. Pandžić, *Dirac cohomology of some Harish-Chandra modules*, Transform. Groups. **14** (2009), 163–173.

[19] J. E. Humphreys, *Introduction to Lie Algebras and Representation Theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1972.

[20] H. Jakobsen, *Hermitian symmetric spaces and their unitary highest weight modules*, J. Funct. Anal. **52** (1983), 385–412.

[21] A. Joseph, *The minimal orbit in a simple Lie algebra and its associated maximal ideal*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. **9** (1976), 1–29.

[22] A. Knapp, *Lie Groups, Beyond an Introduction*, Birkhäuser, 2nd Edition, 2002.

[23] A. Knapp and D. Vogan, *Cohomological induction and unitary representations*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N.J., 1995.

[24] W. McGovern, *Rings of regular functions on nilpotent orbits II: Model algebras and orbits*, Commun. Alg. **22** (1994), 765–772.

[25] R. Parthasarathy, *Dirac operators and the discrete series*, Ann. of Math. **96** (1972), 1–30.

[26] R. Parthasarathy, *Criteria for the unitarizability of some highest weight modules*, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. **89** (1980), 1–24.

[27] S. Salamanca-Riba, *On the unitary dual of real reductive Lie groups and the $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$ modules: the strongly regular case*, Duke Math. J. **96** (1999), 521–546.

[28] S. Salamanca-Riba, D. Vogan, *On the classification of unitary representations of reductive Lie groups*, Ann. of Math. **148** (1998), 1067–1133.

[29] D. Vogan, *Singular unitary representations*, Noncommutative harmonic analysis and Lie groups (Marseille, 1980), Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. **880**, Springer, Berlin, 1981, pp. 506–535.
[30] D. Vogan, *Unitarizability of certain series of representations*, Ann. Math. **120** (1984), 141–187.
[31] D. Vogan, *The unitary dual of $GL(n)$ over an Archimedean field*, Invent. Math. **83** (1986), 449–505.
[32] D. Vogan, *Dirac operators and unitary representations*, 3 talks at MIT Lie groups seminar, Fall 1997.
[33] D. P. Zhelobenko, *Harmonic analysis on complex seimsimple Lie groups*, Mir, Moscow, 1974.

(Ding) College of Mathematics and Econometrics, Hunan University, Changsha 410082, P. R. China
E-mail address: dingjain@hnu.edu.cn

(Dong) Institute of Mathematics, Hunan University, Changsha 410082, P. R. China
E-mail address: chaoping@hnu.edu.cn